



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,847	02/11/2002	Hee Young Yun	8733.059.21	9705
30827	7590	10/02/2006	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP			TON, MINH TOAN T	
1900 K STREET, NW			ART UNIT	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			PAPER NUMBER	
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/068,847	YUN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Toan Ton	2871	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-36 and 49-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-36 and 49-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 08/888,164.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 33-36 and 49-54 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,537.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are broader in scope in the patented claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,537.

Art Unit: 2871

Claims 33-36 and 49-54 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,942.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are broader in scope in the patented claims. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are broader in scope in the patented claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,942.

Claims 33-36 and 49-54 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-52 of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,457.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are broader in scope in the patented claims. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are broader in scope in the patented claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,457.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 33-35, 49 and 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Masanori (JP 07-099394).

Art Unit: 2871

Masanori discloses a flat display device comprising (see at least Figure 1): a first structure 6 having a plurality of first surfaces (e.g., side surfaces); a second structure 8 having at least one second surface substantially parallel to a predetermined one of the plurality of first surfaces; a flat display panel 2 adjacent the first and second structures, the flat panel display comprising a display surface for displaying an image, wherein the display surface is substantially nonparallel with the plurality of first surfaces.

Masanori discloses (immovably) fixing means for fixing the first and second structures together, wherein the fixing means comprise such as screw(s). Further, Masanori discloses fixing means comprising structures via screws through holes in the side surfaces/edges (see at least Figure 1), i.e., fixing means provided in a direction substantially non-perpendicular to with the display surface.

Masanori discloses the second structure comprising second and third surfaces (see at least Figure 1).

Masanori discloses the first structure 6 contacting the flat display panel 2 (see at least Figure 1).

Masanori discloses the flat display panel being a liquid crystal display panel (see at least Abstract).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2871

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 36 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masanori as applied to claims 33-35, 49, 51-54 above.

Other fixing means such as hooks, adhesive material are at least obvious variations (i.e., not patentably distinct) to fixing means such as screws since all are desired for securing structures together. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ fixing means such as hooks, adhesive, screws, as at least obvious variations (i.e., not patentably distinct) to each other for advantages such as properly securing structures together.

Portable devices incorporating liquid crystal display are common and known in the art since LCD offers advantages such as lightweight, high resolution. Therefore, it would have been at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ portable devices incorporating liquid crystal display, as common and known in the art, since LCD offers advantages such as lightweight, high resolution.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 07/25/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Masanori discloses fixing means comprising structures via screws through holes in the side surfaces/edges (see at least Figure 1), i.e., fixing means provided in a direction substantially non-perpendicular to with the display surface.


Art Unit: 2871

***Contact Information***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2303.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 20, 2006

  
TOANTON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER